

Addendum for Statement of Work (SOW) – DHS #09-022
Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS)
Project Title: Web-Based Collaborative Forms Generation Tool

Vendor Questions and Answers:

Questions	Answer
A. Schedule Questions:	
A1. What is the completion date of the contract?	The completion date of the contract will be negotiated with the selected vendor.
A2. With an anticipated project start date of Feb 1, 2010 and a cost not to exceed \$120,000, should the completion date be sooner than the date listed in the SOW of June 30, 2011? Or, is this work part time over the duration of the 18 months from Feb 2010 to June 2011?	Migration can be any time before June 30, 2011.
A3. Schedule: The project starts Feb 1, 2010 and ends June 30, 2011 according to the SOW. Does this include the 12 months warranty period? If so the development of the tool must be completed and installed by June 30, 2010?	We would expect the warranty period to begin upon acceptance of the product.
A4. Please provide DHS preferred date by when this tool/web-system must be deployed and available for general use?	The only preference we have is that the product be delivered no later than June 30, 2011.
A5. If State provides a target date in its response to the previous question, can we propose an alternate schedule (may be earlier than the State specified date)?	Yes
B. Cost Questions:	
B1. Is the budget of \$120,000 the total budget, development for 5 months and support for 12 months?	The SOW states that ongoing support begins after the receipt of all deliverables and completion of required knowledge transfer, and that ongoing support may not even be needed by CS&ED. Vendors should propose how they would address the issue of ongoing support in the work plan section of their proposal, but not in their cost proposal. Please review Response Requirements section of SOW (4.d and 4.f).
B2. In case of Time & Material project, how many vendor personnel should be assigned to this project?	We expect vendors to suggest this in their proposal.
B3. "The total cost of the project is not expected to exceed \$120,000" – State's "Total Cost" expectation for this complete SDLC development project for duration of 17 months (based on Anticipated Start Date of Feb-2010 and end date of June-2011) seems to be low. Please confirm State's budget for this initiative and on what basis this budget amount was determined.	\$120,000 is the total budget amount we expect to have available for this project. The timeline of 17 months is a maximum timeline. The product can be delivered sooner than June 2011.
B4. The total cost of the project is not expected to exceed \$120,000. Does this include professional services and any new hardware and software proposed?	Our expectation is that we will spend no more than \$120,000 for professional/technical services, software and hardware required for the proposed solution. While the development and delivery of a customized forms generation tool may be part of a professional/technical contract, State purchasing laws and policies do not allow us to purchase commodity-type items (hardware, software) as part of a professional/ technical contract. If DHS must purchase hardware or software for this project, it will be in accordance with State commodity procurement procedures and not part of the professional/technical contract

Addendum for Statement of Work (SOW) – DHS #09-022
Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS)
Project Title: Web-Based Collaborative Forms Generation Tool

Questions	Answer
C. Business questions:	
C1. How many templates do you think there may be with a new system?	Currently, there are 4 PRISM legal documents. One of the documents, the modification order, has about 465 embeds users can choose from. In addition, users have the option of adding their own paragraphs throughout the document. We may add a minimum of two more legal documents. There currently are 6 pro se legal forms and a packet of instructions.
C2. What information would one need to determine which template to use in a specific case?	County users begin their modification processes basically the same way – they have already done a review of the circumstances on the case, and have decided a modification of the order is appropriate. They begin with creating a motion, an affidavit, and a proposed order. The options within the document are chosen based on the facts of the case. Pro se users also begin their modification process with a template that results in unique documents that reflect their circumstances. Pro se forms have far fewer options than the PRISM forms.
C3. How many onsite vendor resources does State estimate for this project in each category viz Project Manager, Architect, Business/System Analyst, Programmer Analyst etc.,?	We expect the vendor to suggest this in their proposal.
C4. Can the vendors offer a solution by which key vendor personnel work onsite at DHS offices and other vendor team members (i.e. programmers, etc.) work remotely from a separate vendor owned development center located outside Minnesota?	Yes
C5. Are there any Minnesota laws that prohibit the vendor from leveraging vendor owned facilities outside the USA, for completing vendor responsibilities identified in this SOW?	Per the SOW, all services must be performed within the borders of the United States. Please see “Foreign Outsourcing of Work Prohibited” heading in General Requirements section of SOW.
C6. “Required Qualifications” have been provided only for Project Manager staff. On page#5 of the SOW the document requests that “the response must specifically indicate how Responder’s proposed staff meets or exceeds all the Required Qualifications”. Please clarify whether the State is looking for only a Project Manager Staff or a team of qualified vendor professionals with various roles to meet the needs of this SOW.	Please see the Required Qualifications Section (page #3) of the SOW. It states that proposed project staff collectively must meet all the minimum qualifications, except where an individual is indicated. The proposed project manager/lead is the only individual proposed staff member who must meet a specific Required Qualification -three years of experience in all phases of IT project management.
C7. How many work spaces can the State provide to the vendor team members for the duration of the project?	We do not anticipate office space to be a problem.
C8. Will DHS provide normal office space, desktops, software, and hardware to the vendor resources performing services under this contract award? Please help the vendors understand what will be provided and what will not be provided?	Workspace with standard DHS desktops can be made available.
C9. Will State provide onsite parking for the vendor team members?	Parking will be available for vendor team members, but the State does not pay for any associated parking contract fees.
C10. How many Subject Matter Experts (SME’s) will be allocated to this project?	CSED has three business analysts and will also utilize county experts as necessary.

Addendum for Statement of Work (SOW) – DHS #09-022
Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS)
Project Title: Web-Based Collaborative Forms Generation Tool

Questions	Answer
C11.How many hours per week of each SME is State planning to allocate for the project?	Currently each business analyst is available a minimum of 20 hours each week, but resources may be adjusted with the priority of this project as well as other CSED priorities
C12.“Document Generation System” – We are assuming that there will be data entry forms in the new system to populate dynamic data in generated documents. Please confirm and provide an approximate number for different types of forms involved in this automation. Can you also provide links to soft copies of these forms?	We have both dynamic and user entered data in our forms. See question #1 above for approximate numbers of forms involved in this SOW. We do not have links available to PRISM forms, but pro se forms can be seen in their current format on the Minnesota Courts Self Help Center website at: www.mncourts.gov/selfhelp and follow the child support forms links, ex pro support forms, modify child support. Sample pro se form numbers are CSX202, CSX203, CSX102, FAM 102, CON 111, CON 112.
C13.Has the State/CSED gathered requirements and prepared any documents for capabilities/features identified on page#2? If yes, can you share the same with the vendor community?	No
C14.“Scope of this SOW...” – Scope mentioned here does not seem to include “Requirements Gathering”. Would the Vendor be responsible for gathering requirements for this SOW? Please clarify.	There may be some gathering of technical requirements needed. We will also have CSED technical staff available as needed.
C15.How many different types of forms should the system provide data entry screens for? Please list the various types of forms and associated quantities.	See answers to questions C1 and C12 above.
C16.Are there any reports required in this web system? If yes, Please provide a list of reports with brief descriptions about each of the report.	We do not have any reports identified at this time. However, there may be a need for minimal reports relating to usage of the product.
C17.What is the anticipated duration of the ongoing support?	Please refer to the Agency Project Requirements and Response Requirements sections in the SOW. We do not have a specific time frame in mind at this time. Vendors may include time frames in their Response when proposing their approach for providing this service.
C18.Examples of the forms?	Please refer to answers in questions C1 and C12.
C19.What do they do with supporting documents?	Supporting documents are typically attached to the legal forms filed with the court.
C20.In the current process what happens to the documents that are generated by PRISM and filled out by appropriate parties? Does it get filed, scanned etc.? What are the changes required for this process?	Currently, county users print the legal documents, send hard copies to the county attorney for edits and approval. The county attorney sends them back to the child support officer (CSO) to modify and reprint/resend if changes are needed, and ultimately the CSO will copy the documents, sending the original to be filed with the court. The copies are mailed (served) on the parties. At minimum, we want to electronically send, and edit, the legal documents back and forth from the CSO to the county attorney.
C21.Are the forms used my different counties the same with different data or are they entirely different forms?	PRISM provides the same four forms to every county. However, the nature of the forms allows users to enter additional data not offered in the forms.

Addendum for Statement of Work (SOW) – DHS #09-022
Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS)
Project Title: Web-Based Collaborative Forms Generation Tool

Questions	Answer
C22.How are the "Parties" notified about the decision or change in state of the document? Does this stay the same for the new system or does this workflow change.	Parties are not typically notified about changes in the documents. Documents are not changed once they are printed and signed. The “decision” goes to the parties in the form of a court order, which is one of the forms listed above. The Child Support Magistrate may issue an order independent of PRISM when there has been a court hearing. We do not anticipate the work flow changing, other than we would like to see the child support magistrate have access to the forms when they create their order. Data in the forms should be able to populate an order template used by the magistrate. The order template for the magistrate may even be a new form coming out of this development process.
C23.In the current system once the document is generated in PRISM what are the stages that the document goes through? Are there different processes depending on the source Party? What are these stages, doable actions and the results of various actions performed. At completion of the process what is the outcome/ state of the document? What are the post approval actions or processes? Are “Parties” or other authorities editing the document throughout the process or just the state of the document changes not the content?	PRISM forms are tracked through the use of a status code: PEN (pending), INC (incomplete) and PRT (printed). Other ways ‘stages’ might be answered: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Child support officers draft the documents and print 2. Documents are mailed (hard copy) to the county attorney for editing/approval 3. If the document is returned for edits, the child support officer edits, re-prints and resends to the county attorney for signature. 4. County attorney signs and forwards back to the CSO (in most counties) for copying, mailing and filing. Post approval, the child support officer may get new information that would require the process to start over with new forms. Document content cannot be changed once the signatures are in place.
C24.What are the signature requirements? Is there already a mechanism for Electronic signatures? Is Electronic Signature a requirement? If it's not a requirement how are signatures managed and stored.	The child support officer and county attorney sign the documents. CSED forms technology does not have electronic signature options at this time.
C25.Can you provide an estimate of the number of total and concurrent users of this tool?	We do not have any good estimates for the number of county users. Not all county child support staff have order modification duties. As for the pro se documents, it is difficult to estimate how many child support participants may use the product at one time. In 2008, over 2,000 pro se actions were filed and completed statewide. Many more may use the system, without following through with the action.
C26.Do you expect that Public Users (Pro Se Litigants) would need to Sign In or Authenticate against a centralized system such as Active Directory or Database in order to Create and Submit documents?	No, we prefer not to have to authenticate each user. However, this answer could change depending on where the product for pro se litigants is housed.
C27.What Project Management Methodologies are used by the MN DHS?	CSED follows the project management principles published by the Project Management Institute.
C28.Is this tool to be owned or housed within OET?	Unknown at this time
C29.What level of training is expected?	CSED trainers will train county and court users. For pro se users, we would prefer the application has some sort of tutorial or guide.
C30. How many forms are in place today?	See answers to questions C1 and C12
C31.What is the expected number of forms that will need to be created?	See answers to questions C1 and C12

Addendum for Statement of Work (SOW) – DHS #09-022
Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS)
Project Title: Web-Based Collaborative Forms Generation Tool

Questions	Answer
C32.What number of forms will need to be migrated?	See answers to questions C1 and C12
C33.What number of forms will be retired and not part of this project?	We have no plans to retire any forms at this time
C34.Can you elaborate on the statement “Ability for staff to create or modify” forms?	See answer to question C23.
C35.Please clarify the statement “CSED does not require a single forms generation tool or process to achieve our desired outcomes.”	By this we mean we have no preference if the solution is the same for pro se forms as it is for the PRISM documents.
C36.When templates are created or modified by “county staff and magistrates”, is the underlying schema likely to change (i.e. the actual data fields collected) or are template changes by those users expected to be restricted to using the existing set of data fields?	It is possible that data on PRISM will change after the documents are created, and therefore the data will need to be overwritten. However, we do not have enough information to answer this question at this time.
C37.DHS deals with a broad range of different forms and has other document storage/management needs beyond those included in this SOW. Is selection of a response to this SOW linked to the suitability of that response to the broader DHS needs or will the selected solution stand completely on its own?	We anticipate it will stand on its own at this point. However, it may provide guidance for future child support solutions. The solution must meet current DHS enterprise architecture standards.
D. Technical Questions	
D1. Is Pilgrim Software an acceptable type/brand of research compliance enterprise software	No specific products have been recommended or ruled out at this point
D2. What is the preferred platform to host the application? (Windows / Unix / Linux)	DHS currently has multiple hosting platforms available
D3. Is there a preferred development environment such as Java or .NET?	No preference. However, CSED has Java resource, but none for .NET.
D4. Will this application interact with FileNet?	No plans for this at this point. FileNet is the DHS enterprise document storage solution.
D5. How fluid or static are templates?	Fluid
D6. Can .NET development be used for custom development (inside SharePoint)?	See answer to D3 above
D7. The SOW states the front end needs to be developed in HTML/XML/DHTML CSS Javascript. Can the back end be developed in PHP to reduce development time and keep costs down?	Not recommended at this time.
D8. Is there any additional hardware that is being purchased as part of this project?	Not determined at this time.
D9. Does the State have a preference with respect to a custom developed solution vs. COTS solution? Please provide State’s preference.	No.
D10.Has DHS evaluated any existing COTS product for this project? If yes, please provide the name and details of the products evaluated.	We have looked at DHS’s Liquid Office, and may use it for other fillable format type documents
D11.Will State provide the vendor resources VPN access to its systems for the purpose o remotely accessing State network for project purposes?	Yes.
D12.Please confirm that State will host this new web application/tool in State’s production environment.	Yes.

Addendum for Statement of Work (SOW) – DHS #09-022
Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS)
Project Title: Web-Based Collaborative Forms Generation Tool

Questions	Answer
D13. Please confirm that Sate will provide development, testing, acceptance and production environments for this project.	This will be provided as needed
D14. Please confirm the State's expectation of the technology platform to be used (i.e Java/J2EE/Java EE) for the new system.	The SOW says "not limited to."
D15. Please provide a copy of IT technical standards used within DHS/CSED.	DHS has standards for information security, data privacy, hardware, software and specific department solutions (such as IVR products, address standardization, and electronic document management), but they are not currently available in a shareable format at this time.
D16. What is State's preference with respect to the Application/Web Server (i.e WebSphere, Oracle 10g application server, WebLogic etc.) to be used for this tool?	We currently use Websphere, but have no preference. DHS currently supports a broad spectrum of application servers
D17. What is State's preference with respect to the RDBMS database (Oracle, SQL Server, DB2 UDB, etc.) to be used for this tool?	DHS currently supports a broad base of RDBMS architectures
D18. Will "SharePoint" be used in this project? If yes, please provide the purpose and details of integrating "SharePoint" with this tool.	This has not been determined, but it is not a requirement.
D19. How many business days of User Acceptance Testing does the DHS expect to perform?	We are unable to determine this without seeing the scope of the solution
D20. "Document Generation System" – In what file format (such as .DOC, .PDF, etc.) the documents should be generated?	Must meet the State and DHS enterprise standards
D21. "File and document sharing that stores documents and files in a common area" – Is DHS/CSED planning to store the files and documents in an Image Repository leveraging FileNet or similar products or in a common shared drive?	Must meet the enterprise architecture standards
D22. "Security features" – Could you please elaborate on these security features? Typical web applications are designed with Encryption (SSL/HTTPS), Authentication and Authorization security features. What additional security features should be provided that will be unique to this tool?	Must meet the State of Minnesota web security standards that govern the storage, access and use of private data.
D23. "Data field interface capability" – Will this be a file based interface or database based? What information will be exchanged between this tool and the PRISM? Please provide more details.	CSED has multiple data interface capabilities. Access method will be determined based on the proposed solution
D24. "The selected Responder is required to perform at least 50% of the work on site" – What kind of activities is the responder expected to perform onsite? Please provide more details.	It is expected that the selected Responder will perform at least 50% of work on site to facilitate ease of communication, collaboration, oversight, etc. It is possible that some project activities may be performed offsite. Vendors should address work location(s) in their proposed work plan.
D25. "CSED will have primary responsibility for web page design" – Is this only for Static web pages on this new tool? Who will be responsible for developing dynamic pages such as web based data entry forms pages within the tool?	Primarily, CSED will design and approval all work results. Pages must meet all DHS web standards

Addendum for Statement of Work (SOW) – DHS #09-022
Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS)
Project Title: Web-Based Collaborative Forms Generation Tool

Questions	Answer
D26. Please clarify what the State means by the above statement - "CSED will have primary responsibility for web page design". Will State be providing web developers to the project or will the State be responsible for providing the look and feel design for all the web pages in the system. State's statement is not clear. Please clarify States position and expectation.	See answer in D25
D27. "Integration of this application with the content..." – Please clarify as to what kind of integration is needed here. Is it just through links to point to these applications or to bring some dynamic contents from these web sites and display them in this tool? Please provide the purpose and more details on this integration.	See answer in D23
D28. What are the possible assumptions we can make around technologies (if any)? Does it have to be fully browser based or can we assume the users will have a thick client?	Should be browser based
D29. Are the adjustments made to the primary record or are these supplemental documents that tie to the parent "Child Support" document? Do they have to tie back to the original "Child Support" document?	Versioning is highly recommended. As a rule, we do not modify primary records
D30. In the current system where is the primary documents (the original child support document) stored?	PRISM stores all data and electronic versions of documents and templates. The counties and courts maintain hard copies.
D31. In the current system how are interested parties presented appropriate documents from PRISM?	Recipients/participants receive all modification documents by U.S. Mail
D32. Depending on the modification source, Private Attorney, Child Support Office, vs. Participant does the data source differ? Where is the data that PRISM currently uses to generate the documents?	Only the child support office staff has access to PRISM data. All PRISM data is stored in Adabas files on the mainframe.
D33. Will Users need access to the site before they can create documents and contribute content? Does a user request access to the site before they can participate in the modification process?	Pro Se users will have to access the site before they can create documents and contribute content. Depending on the solution, a user may have to request access to the site.
D34. Who has access to create documents and how are they getting access? Is there a central gatekeeper that manages access today? Will there be gatekeepers (depending on splitting of responsibility there may be multiple i.e. by County etc.) to manage access to the site and resources? Since documents have to be restricted to certain parties and groups who will be managing this process? Automated workflow processes vs. human.	Currently there are security officers in the counties that work with state security staff. State security staff are the gatekeepers to add, modify or remove security access for all PRISM users. We also have a web system (Minnesota Child Support Online) that uses self-registration and password reset capabilities.
D35. If the site is anonymously accessible and document permissions and routing managed by internal workflows, are we collecting identifying information about the source "Parties" such as SSN, Name, Address, Email(not all users might have one) in the document itself? Does this data need to be validated with internal data sources?	Yes, we may be collecting identifying information in the documents. Data security is critical. No, we do not need to validate with internal sources.
D36. How are the users presented with their document history? Is there a requirement for users to see previous documents relevant to their case that may already have been approved archived etc.?	No history required for source parties (participants) as the vision is to not authenticate them

Addendum for Statement of Work (SOW) – DHS #09-022
Minnesota Department of Human Services (DHS)
Project Title: Web-Based Collaborative Forms Generation Tool

Questions	Answer
D37.Does the new system have to consume data from other systems to generate documents or is the system replacing the entire process from document creation to document archiving? This implies that all data required for the document to be a valid document, is stored in the document and not generated by consuming other external data sources?	Yes, the new system will need to access data from PRISM dynamically when creating and modifying documents. Once the document is completed the data becomes a static part of the document showing a 'point in time' view.
D38.Does the new tool have to be backward compatible? How are the users going to view existing/older "Modification Documents" after the new system is implemented, use PRISM or does the new system need to be backward compatible?	No, there will not be a conversion of existing into the new system
D39.What is the notification requirement for interested "Parties" i.e. the document submitter, the approver etc. Is Email and option? Since the process can be initiated by any constituent that has/is offered "Child Support" by the state is Email realistic? If email is not an option what are the notification points and what medium (mail, email, fax etc.)?	We need to meet legal requirements of service of process in getting documents to the recipients. Notification process for internal county workers – including county attorneys- has more flexibility (can use email for example).
D40.Elaborate on "Data field interface capability with the statewide mainframe computer system (PRISM) "	See answer D23
D41.Is the new archiving process automated or manual? If automated what constitutes a record vs. a working document? How does a document turn into a record (metadata, document state, date time record etc.)? What happens to the data in the documents? Does it get keyed into PRISM and the documents sits in the new system?	System must meet all legal and DHS enterprise record retention requirements. Also see D37.
D42.Is Microsoft SharePoint currently implemented within MN DHS? If so, what version? MOSS 2007 Standard or Enterprise?	Yes, MOSS 2007 Enterprise
D43.Please describe briefly the current state of server and network topology that will eventually house the proposed solution.	OET Enterprise has details on network and server requirements for vendors available online. http://www.state.mn.us/portal/mn/jsp/content.do?id=-536891917&agency=OETweb
D44.What is the expectation around how users will access these reports? Via a website? Internal or External?	Unknown, reports for internal use only.
D45.Is the solution to be Section 508/ADA compliant? WCAG Compliant? What levels of compliance should the solution meet?	Yes, DHS web standards must be met. Compliance with section 508 is one of the standards.
D46.Please elaborate on the Statewide Enterprise Architecture that the proposed solution must be in compliance with? Are there any technical and implementation constraints we need to be aware of?	See D43
D47.Please elaborate on the PRISM integration requirements? PRISM mentioned on page 2 under bullet point "Data field interface capability..."	See D23
D48.Is the proposed solution expected to integrate or collect information from other data sources? If so, what type and who would control those?	Integration with PRISM only
D49.In the SOW, SharePoint is specifically listed in the DHS current environment. Is there any CSED preference or expectation for or against basing the solution on the SharePoint platform?	No preference